Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application N	0.	Applicant(s)		
	09/884,921		PERETTI, MARCO		
	Examiner		Art Unit		
	Christopher A.	Revak	2131		
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>response to non-final</u>					
(1) Christopher A. Revak.	(3)	(3)			
(2) <u>Cameron Beddard</u> .	(4)	(4)			
Date of Interview: 9 May 2007 Time:					
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ N  If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representa	ative)			
Part I.	·				
Rejection(s) discussed:			•		
Claims discussed: 1,10,18,22					
Prior art documents discussed:  Galipeau et al, US Patent 5,799,141					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE	OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:		
Part III.					
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>					
				·	
CII					
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	pplicant/Applicant's Re	presentative Sig	gnature – if appi	opriate)	

**Application No. 09/884,921** 

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and applicant's representative discussed the prior art reference of Galipeau in attempt to compact prosecution in order to overcome the reference. The examiner noted that the proposed amendment did not have support in the applicant's specification, however upon further consideration, the examiner indicated that dependent claim 10 was not taught by the prior art teachings and suggested incorporating the limitation from claim 10 into indepenent claims 1,18, and 22. The applicant agreed to an examiner's amendment in order to compact prosecution.